

AU/AWCL/153/1998-04

SCHOOL

AIR UNIVERSITY

INSTRUMENTS OF PEACE:
THE VIABLE AND STRATEGIC ROLE OF RELIGIOUS
LEADERSHIP FACTORS IN AVERTING WAR

by

Vergel L. Lattimore, Ch, Lt Col, USAF

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

Advisor: Col Gail Arnott, USAF, PhD

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama

April 1998

Report Documentation Page		
Report Date 01APR1998	Report Type N/A	Dates Covered (from... to) -
Title and Subtitle Instruments of Peace: The Viable and Strategic Role of Religious Leadership Factors in Averting War	Contract Number	
	Grant Number	
	Program Element Number	
Author(s) Lattimore, Vergel L.	Project Number	
	Task Number	
	Work Unit Number	
Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es) Air War College Maxwell AFB, AI 36112	Performing Organization Report Number	
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es)	Sponsor/Monitor's Acronym(s)	
	Sponsor/Monitor's Report Number(s)	
Distribution/Availability Statement Approved for public release, distribution unlimited		
Supplementary Notes		
Abstract		
Subject Terms		
Report Classification unclassified	Classification of this page unclassified	
Classification of Abstract unclassified	Limitation of Abstract UU	
Number of Pages 61		

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense. In accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the United States government.

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
DISCLAIMER	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
PREFACE	vi
ABSTRACT	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
 PEACEMAKING: A THEOLOGICAL AND GLOBAL SECURITY	
IMPERATIVE.....	3
Peacemaking Defined and Differentiated	3
Peacemaking: A Theological Issue	7
Hinduism.....	7
Islam.....	9
Judaism	10
Christianity.....	12
Understanding Terrorism.....	15
Summary	19
RELIGIOUS LEADERSHIP FACTORS	22
Religion and International Affairs	22
Religious Authority and Moral Sensitivity	24
Summary	26
BRIDGES FOR PEACE AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION	28
A Framework for Peace	28
Paradoxical Values of Peacemaking	30
Summary	31
 CORE COMPETENCIES IN FAITH-BASED PEACEMAKING AND GLOBAL	
MINISTRY IN THE 21 ST CENTURY.....	32
Chaplain as Peacemaker and Consultant	32
Roles for Religiously-Oriented Agents.....	35
Summary	38
CONCLUSIONS	40

Implications of the Religious Voice in Proactive Global Diplomacy.....	40
Common Ground for Meaningful Religious Engagement.....	43
APPENDIX A: LIST OF INTERNATIONAL PEACEMAKING ORGANIZATIONS	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY	50

List of Tables

	<i>Page</i>
Table 1 – Conflict Transformation: A Comparison	29
Table 2 – Understanding the Three Dynamics.....	37

Preface

This research project explores the extent to which religious leadership factors and actors play constructive roles in preventing war. My interest in this topic is directly related to my dual professional posture in the military. My ordination as an Elder in the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church affirms and endorses me to serve as a commissioned chaplain in the U.S. Air Force. As a chaplain, my primary tasks involve: 1) ensuring that members understand the nature of and have full opportunity for the free exercise of religion; and 2) providing pastoral and spiritual care to members and their families. Symbolically, I strive to minister with people and to remind them that they are not simply tools or objects to protect freedom, but they are human beings created in the image of a loving God. Each human being is a unique creation. My purpose is not to endorse the potential violence and destructiveness of war, but I see myself, in the broadest sense, as a “voice of peace” in the chambers of war.

I extend sincere appreciation to my research advisor, Colonel Gail Arnott, Ph.D., who received my proposal with enthusiasm and provided helpful suggestions for interviewing relevant Air War College (AWC) faculty. I also appreciate the willing support of the following AWC faculty who granted informal interviews to focus my research: Dr. James W. Toner, Professor of International Relations and Military Ethics; Dr. Grant T. Hammond, Chair of National Security Studies; and Dr. Kathleen Mahoney-Norris, Major, USAFR, Professor of International Security Studies. Finally, I am grateful

for a telephone consultation with Dr. Louis Kriesburg, former Director of the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts, Syracuse University.

Abstract

In order to determine the viable and strategic role that religious leadership factors play in war aversion, peacemaking, and conflict resolution, this research employed a critical historical and social analysis methodology. This study investigated the question: “Can religious beliefs, convictions, and values of leaders be an effective force in fostering peacemaking?” The research sought to determine the validity of the following assumptions: 1) religious differences are often at the crux of war and social conflict; 2) the religious values, convictions, and ideals of leaders are frequently overlooked and underestimated elements in preventive diplomacy; 3) the overt and covert application of religious factors is a missing dimension in statecraft; 4) religious leaders, as well as religious-motivated officials, can function as catalytic agents and actors in preventing the causes of conflicts and encouraging the conditions for peace; and 5) religious leaders and wise citizen diplomats can serve as vital bridges, fostering understanding and trust between opposing parties.

The key findings of this study reveal the following: 1) multi-track diplomacy, focusing on positive peace, includes religious leadership and spiritual factors as vital avenues; 2) the emergence of faith-based terrorism will require the effective counter-balance of faith-oriented sanctions for peace; 3) religion plays a key role in international relations and religiously motivated actors can sensitively assert moral authority without becoming morally self-righteous and without ignoring security concerns;

4) transformative peacemaking includes the four paradoxical values of personal and social change, justice and mercy, empowerment and interdependence, and attention to process and outcome in relationship restoration; 4) requisite core competencies are needed to effectively conduct faith-based peacemaking and global ministry in the 21st century; and 6) chaplains and other religiously motivated agents can function in diverse roles in the peacemaking process. The study concludes by affirming the implications of the “voice of faith” in the international global diplomacy and by confirming the existence of common ground for religious engagement in peacemaking.

Chapter 1

Introduction

[God] will settle arguments between nations. They will pound their swords and spears into plowshares and pruning hooks, they will never make war or attack one another.

Isaiah 2:4, CEV

The practices of religion and the practices of social violence often share common, but differently interpreted, theological and spiritual foundations. The first line of the above epigraph seems to imply that God is the ultimate arbitrator of international disputes and conflicts. The second line describes the postwar, peacetime conversion of the instruments of war. Thus, the instruments of war become the tools for human survival and economic productivity.

Peacemaking, like the execution of war, is generally perceived as the sole prerogative of nation-states. However, the instruments of war and the instruments of peace affect the fundamental survivability of humankind. Thus, peacemaking requires moral discipline, ethical analysis, human wisdom, and spiritual intervention. The aim of this paper is to answer the question— **“Can the religious beliefs, convictions, and values of leaders be an effective force in fostering peacemaking?”**

In chapter two, the discussion focuses on peacemaking as a global security requirement. Chapter three explores the religious leadership factors involved in international affairs and their moral import. Chapter four highlights key bridges for

peacemaking and conflict resolution. Chapter five formulates the essential competencies for faith-based peacemaking. Finally, the conclusion outlines the implications of the religious voice in local and global peacemaking and preventive diplomacy, as well as common ground for meaningful religious engagement in peacemaking efforts.

Chapter 2

Peacemaking: A Theological and Global Security Imperative

The problem of peace and security is indeed far more important than the conflict between socialism and capitalism. Man must first ensure his survival; only then can he ask himself what type of existence he prefers....The struggle for power is equally repulsive, conducted as it is, both here and there, with the traditional dishonesty of the political craft.

—Albert Einstein

Peacemaking and global security are different sides of the same coin. Moreover, peacemaking and global security represent a significant relationship in human affairs. To clarify some of the dimensions of this moral quest, this chapter will explore various terms associated with peacemaking, religious foundations of peacemaking, and the ethical challenge of terrorism on peacemaking.

Peacemaking Defined and Differentiated

What is peacemaking and why is it vital to human existence and global security? This section will identify and clarify many of the terms and concepts that are related to peacemaking. As a science, peace has been defined as “a situation in which governors of states limit their use of physical coercion to acts that are not likely to encounter extended, organized, and effective physical resistance.”¹

The following is a concise listing of distinguishing terms, which will be given further elaboration later in this discussion:²

- **Peace Operations:** Encompasses peacekeeping operations (PKO), peace enforcement operations (PEO), and other military operations conducted in support of diplomatic efforts to establish and maintain peace.
- **Peacekeeping:** Military operations undertaken with the consent of all major parties to a dispute, designed to monitor and facilitate implementation of an agreement (cease fire, truce, etc.) and support diplomatic efforts to reach a long-term political settlement.
- **Peacemaking:** Process of diplomacy, mediation, negotiation, or other forms of peaceful settlement that arranges an end to a dispute and resolves issues that led to conflict.
- **Peace Enforcement:** Application of military force, or the threat of its use normally pursuant to international authorization, to compel compliance with resolutions or sanctions designed to maintain or restore peace and order.
- **Peace Building:** Post-conflict actions, predominantly diplomatic and economic, that strengthen and rebuild governmental infrastructure and institutions in order to avoid a relapse into conflict.
- **End State:** What the national command authorities (NCA) want the situation to be when operations conclude—both military operations, as well as those where the military is in support of other instruments of national power.

From the perspective of the United Nations (UN) the terms preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping are essentially related. However, they are distinguished and defined as follows:³

- **Preventive diplomacy** is action to prevent disputes from arising between parties, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.
- **Peacemaking** is action to bring hostile parties to agreement, essentially through such peaceful means as those foreseen in Chapter VI of the Charter of the United Nations.
- **Peacekeeping** is the deployment of a United Nations presence in the field, hitherto with the consent of all the parties concerned, normally involving the

United Nations military and/or police personnel and frequently civilians as well. Peacekeeping is a technique that expands the possibilities for both the prevention of conflict and the making of peace.

One of the clearest and most comprehensive definitions of peacekeeping is the following one, which addresses a synthesis of the International Peace Academy and historical United Nations outlooks:

Peacekeeping is an international technique used in conjunction with diplomacy for the purpose of conflict management. Peacekeeping operations employ voluntary military and diplomatic personnel from one or more countries to either create the conditions for conflict resolution or to prevent further hostilities through supervision of an or final settlement of the conflict. Peacekeeping forces are impartial and exist only with the consent of all disputing Parties; therefore, peacekeeping forces do not interfere with the internal affairs of the host countries or use coercion to enforce agreements—the use of force is limited to self-defense.⁴

Peacekeeping has also been contrasted with confidence building. In short, “peacekeeping (and the associated terms peace observing and peace verifying) involves the prevention and termination of hostilities through the peaceful presence of a neutral third party.”⁵ Rather than enforcing or imposing peace by the use of power, peacekeeping

...attempts to create the conditions that would lead to dialogue and the eventual resolution of conflict. In short, its mission is to create space and time in which to allow the combatants to cool off and permit the diplomats to do their work. Thus peacekeeping is not the settlement of a dispute by an overwhelming supranational force intent on imposing an outside solution to a conflict, nor does it stem from collective security sanctions in which an alliance’s military response is triggered by an act of aggression.⁶

Confidence building is a role that aims to minimize conflict between potential opponents. More specifically,

Confidence building measures (CBMs) are techniques designed to lower tensions and make it less likely that a conflict would break out through misunderstanding, mistake, or misreading of the actions of a potential adversary. CBMs emerged from attempts by the Cold War superpowers and their military alliances (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

[NATO] and the Warsaw Pact) to avoid nuclear war by accident or miscalculation...Typical CBMs might include notifying neighboring nations when maneuvers of a certain size are planned near sensitive border areas; establishing direct communication links (“hot lines” between neighboring governments and military establishments; exchanging information on size, deployment, budgets, and weaponry of the military; exchanging personnel in planning and training activities; demilitarizing border areas; and increasing contacts (and thus encouraging military transnationalism) through international military activities such as peacekeeping missions and multinational defense colleges.⁷

From the previous discussion of the broad spectrum of conflict resolution approaches, we can see that religion, religious leadership, and spiritual factors are not overtly identified as resources in peacemaking processes. However, *Multi-Track Diplomacy* does include religion as one of its nine tracks in its conceptual framework of peacemaking.⁸ Operationally defined,

Multi-Track Diplomacy is a conceptual way to view the processes of international peacemaking in the United States as a whole elephant—that is, as a living system. It looks at that web of interconnected parts (activities, individuals, institutions, communities) that operate together; whether awkwardly or gracefully, for a common goal: a world at peace.⁹

Multi-Track diplomacy is an expansion of Track One (international conflict resolution sought by “formal, official, government-to-government interactions between instructed representatives of sovereign nations”) and Track Two (diplomacy sought by “nongovernmental, informal, and unofficial contacts and activities between private citizens or groups of individuals, sometimes called citizen diplomats or nonstate actors.”)¹⁰

Multi-Track diplomacy also makes two distinctions regarding the word—*peace*. According to Betty Reardon, author and graduate studies administrator, in a booklet published by the Five College Program in Peace and World Security Studies,

Negative peace, focusing on the present and near-future, implies the prevention and eradication of large-scale organized violence (i.e., war).

This concept emphasizes the development of local, national, and global systems which, foster the avoidance of and resolution of conflicts by nonviolent means. A principal aim of such endeavors is to reduce the potential for military conflict through arms control and disarmament...

The concept of *positive peace* emerges from the belief that mere intervals between outbreaks of warfare do not constitute the true opposite of war or violence, and that a second, more permanent approach to peace is therefore essential. This approach calls for the eradication of militarism (that is, the permanent mobilization of society for war) and what is termed structural violence (that is, the brutalizing and often lethal effects of oppressive social systems). Positive peace is generally understood to entail a re-ordering of global priorities so as to promote social justice, economic development, and participatory political processes. This attention to structural issues is motivated both by an understanding that poverty and oppression are a primary cause of violence and war, and by a desire to construct a more humane world future.¹¹

Finally, from the perspective of *positive peace*, this discussion will explore how beliefs and faith-oriented religious leadership elements can foster peacemaking, i.e.,

...the whole range of behaviors that contribute to the prevention, management, and resolution of conflicts; to reconciliation and healing...to influencing policy...to facilitating dialogue, negotiation, and mediation; and to all those activities that lay the foundation for better trust and understanding and improved living conditions to ensure better relations among peoples and nations.¹²

Peacemaking: A Theological Issue

Many major religions or religious communities have made various attempts to address the realities of war and violence, as well as the challenges of peace and peacemaking. In this section, I will highlight four religious communities, chosen because they are widely practiced and because they illustrate a range of views.

Hinduism

Swami Ranganathananda, presenter at the 1968 International Peace Symposium, contends that Hinduism is a world religion that has practiced toleration on a macro-level

(saints and sages), as well as a micro-level (common people and political states).¹³ He underscores the basis of the practice of toleration by referring to author, Dr. S.

Radhakrishnan's *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*:

The Hindu view is not motivated by any considerations of political expediency. It is bound up with its religion and is not policy.... The Hindu attitude is based on a definite philosophy.... Toleration is the homage which the finite mind pays to the inexhaustibility of the Infinite.¹⁴

Moreover, the most dominant source of the sanction for peace and the universality and humanism of Hinduism is formulated in "...the discovery, by the sages of the sacred writing, Upanishad, of the true nature of man as the *Atman*, the immortal divine self, and its unity with Brahman, the infinite self of all beings."¹⁵ The core theme of Hinduism is to understand humanity from an inner, spiritual depth perspective, which moves beyond the limits of "caste or creed, nationality or sex."¹⁶

Ranganathananda argues that the New Testament idea of the spiritual unity of people (love of neighbor, love of self) is portrayed in the sixth verse of the Hindu scripture, Isa Upanishad. It inspires millions of Hindu devotees:

Whoever sees all beings in his own Self and himself in all beings does not, by virtue of that realization, hate any one... When, to that knowing sage, all beings are realized as existing in his own Self, then what delusion, what sorrow can afflict him, perceiving as he does the [spiritual] unity [of all existence]?¹⁷

According to the sacred writing, Brahadaranyka Upanishad, God is understood to be *antaryamin*, inner ruler, of all beings:

He who exists in all beings, Who is the innermost truth in all beings, Whom all beings do not know, Whose body are all beings, Who controls all beings from within, This is your Self, the inner Ruler, the Immortal.¹⁸

Ranganathananda describes war in relationship to the discipline of inner control. He says:

The war which religion summons man to wage is a war within each person. It is a war to discipline the forces of egoism and selfishness, lust and greed. To the extent a man responds to this inner call, to the extent he will be free from the tendency to wage war with his brother man outside. Hinduism prescribes a minimum moral and spiritual discipline for all people in what Patanjali describes as the mahavratas (great disciplines):

Non-killing, truthfulness, non-stealing, continence, and non-receiving [of gifts] are called *yama* [self-control].¹⁹

Finally, Ranganathananda refers to Gandhi's "The Doctrine of the Sword" which seems to counter the notion that peace and nonviolence is weakness:

I do believe that when there is only one choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence. I would rather have India resort to arms in order to defend her honor than that she should in a cowardly manner become or remain a helpless victim to her own dishonor. But I believe that nonviolence is definitely superior to violence, forgiveness more manly than punishment. Nonviolence is the law of our species as violence is the law of the brute. The spirit is dormant in the brute and he knows no law but that of physical might. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law, to strength of spirit. The *rishis* (sages) who discovered the law of nonviolence, in the midst of violence, were greater geniuses than Newton. They were themselves greater warriors than Wellington. Having themselves known the use of arms, they realized their uselessness and taught a weary world that its salvation lay not through violence but through nonviolence.²⁰

Islam

According to K. G. Saiyadain, a presenter at the 1968 International Peace Symposium, a Muslim is not to start war and should only fight in self-defense or in defense of religious freedom. He further cites the Koran, which says:

Fight those who are fighting you [in order to deprive you of your liberty of conscience] but do not commit any excesses. Allah does not love those who do so.²¹

The root meaning of the word—Islam—means peace (*silm*).²² Thus, Islam is not named for its founder—Mohammed—but after its core mission, which is the "promotion

of peace and good fellowship in the world.”²³ Moreover, Islam sees a continuity in the religious and cultural tradition of humanity with God-sent prophetic leaders and reformers meriting equal respect.²⁴ God is perceived as a god for the “entire human race and a source of *rahmat* (beneficence) for all.”²⁵

Viewing race, religion, color and nationality as one of the underlying causes of war, the Prophet rejected these distinctions and appointed Balal, a Negro, to the prestigious office of *muezzin*²⁶.

In Islam, the Koran challenges the individual to use the integrity of their faith to question social, ethical behavior:

O, Ye who believe, be steadfast in the service of God’s truth and bear witness for justice and let not hatred of a people seduce you so that you deal with them unjustly. Act justly for that is what piety demands.²⁷

In addition, the Prophet says: “He who supports a tyrant or oppressor knowing that he is a tyrant casts himself outside the pale of Islam.”²⁸

Finally, Islamic scholar, Saiyadain contends that the words—“Show compassion to those on earth, so that He who is in heaven may show mercy to you”—are nearly the same words spoken by Jesus Christ and Prophet Mohammed.²⁹

Judaism

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, a presenter at the 1968 International Peace Symposium, points out that the history of Israel is one filled with images and causes for battle. He refers to the following cogent statement made by George Holley Gilbert in *The Bible and Universal Peace*:

The ancient Hebrews had a warlike career. They fought the battles of Yahweh for centuries. But when at last their national existence was no more, when they sat and sighed by the ruins of their holy city, or far away among the nations, some among them dreamed of a new wondrous age

that was yet to come. They thought of their past, glorified, indeed, in the far retrospect. But they did not long to have those ages returned unchanged. They dreamed of a future that should be far better than the best their fathers had ever known. And one constant element of that great future—one on which they dwelt with satisfaction—was peace. Out of the soul of centuries of strife and bloodshed blossomed, as a fair lover, the vision of a time when peace should flow as a river. By this vision the Hebrew prophets became leaders of the race toward a future kingdom whose realization is still among the treasures of hope.³⁰

According to the rabbis of the sacred writing, Midrash, peace was to be passionately and aggressively sought:

The Torah does not command you to run after or to pursue the other commandments, but only to fulfill them upon the appropriate occasion. But peace you must seek in your own place and pursue it even to another place as well.³¹

By exploring the wide spectrum of Judaism, the core value which emerges is—love of neighbor as oneself.³² The concept of peace is central to Judaism in, what is described by Jewish scholar, Dr. S. Schwarzchild, as a “radical” relationship:

God, to the Jew, is the radical of radicals, the ‘Ikkar ha ‘Ikkarim, the root of all roots! As Karl Marx reminds us in a famous passage, to be radical means to go to the root. Marx went on to claim that the root of man is man. Judaism, however, insists that the root of man is God. Consequently, when God, the radical, the root of all roots, demands that we seek peace, He demands radically that we radically seek radical peace. Hence, when He demands, “Seek peace and pursue it,” He did not mean seek war, nor did not mean seek peace when it is prudent, popular, or conducive to one’s selfish or national interests. Nor yet did He mean seek peace slowly, under certain and not under other conditions. Because the God of the religious Jew is the root of all radicalism, He is bound to be radical in every respect, insisting on peace now and everywhere—in the methods of operation as well as with respect to the Goal.³³

One of the clearest counter-balances to war is the Judaic instruction—“to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and take the homeless into thy habitation.”³⁴

The challenge of peace, like the cost of war, impacts humanity in victory as well as loss. The following statement was delivered by then Major General Yitzak Rabin, chief of Israel's defense forces at Hebrew University:

Rhetorical phases and cliches are not common in our army, but this scene on the temple mount, beyond the power of words to describe, revealed through a flash of lightning, truths that were deeply hidden. Nevertheless, a strange phenomenon can be observed among our soldiers. Their joy is incomplete, and their celebrations are marred by sorrow and shock. There are even some who abstain from celebrations entirely. The men in the front lines saw with their own eyes not only the glory of victory, but also the price of victory—their comrades fallen beside them soaked in blood. I know too that terrible price paid by our own enemies also touched the hearts of men. It may be that the Jewish people has never learned and never accustomed itself to feel the triumph of conquest and victory, with the result that these are accepted with mixed feelings.³⁵

Finally, the quest for peace is a significant part of the Jewish liturgical practice, as the following “Song of Peace” is expressed during each Sabbath:

Grant us peace, Thy most precious gift, O Thou eternal source of peace, and enable Israel to be its messenger unto the peoples of the earth. Strengthen the bonds of friendship and fellowship among the inhabitants of all lands. Plant virtue in every soul and may the love of thy name hallow every heart. Praised be thou, O Lord, our God, giver of peace.³⁶

Christianity

According to the Right Reverend John H. Burt, a presenter at the 1968 International Peace Symposium, peace sanctions in Christianity are grounded in the following:³⁷

- The ethics of Jesus of Nazareth emerged from his Jewish roots, which embraced the prophetic concerns for human dignity and social justice.
- The moral theology of Christianity has offered a variety of applications of peace and its applications to the problems of war.
- The followers of Christianity have often not met the ethical demands of the Christian faith.

Moreover, Jesus, in his assertion—“Blessed are the peacemakers”(Matthew 5: 9a)—seems to spiritually endorse persons who pursue social peace and human reconciliation. In alliance with his Jewish faith, Jesus “affirmed that ‘love for one’s neighbor’ is a command second in importance only to the greatest requirement of all—love for God.”³⁸ More than advocating for basic human needs (food, clothing, and shelter), and inner peace from social conflict, Jesus stressed “a peace based on justice.”³⁹

At this point, it is important to note that Christian realism provides an instructive corrective and critique to the role of religion in statecraft. Arguing from a biblical and historical perspective, James H. Toner, AWC Professor of Leadership and Ethics, says:

...any statecraft devoid of a sense of limitation is bound inevitably to fail, for politics is not theology; one’s soul is not saved by the devices of economics and diplomacy. Prudent statecraft is a product of sober reflection on the theological insight and on the historical example of man’s proclivity to sin.⁴⁰

Toner’s assertion is corroborated by the theologian Niebuhr:

Good and evil are not determined by some fixed structure of human existence. Man, according to the biblical view, may use his freedom to make himself falsely the center of existence; but this does not change the fact that love rather than self-love is the law of existence in the sense that man can only be healthy and his communities at peace if man is drawn out of himself and saved from the self-defeating consequences of self-love.⁴¹

The teaching and the practice of peace were firmly held during by the followers of Jesus during the first three centuries.⁴² However,

After the Edict of Milan in 313 AD, the Emperor Constantine persuaded the church that preservation of the social order often requires force, and Christians began to see military service as not out of keeping with loyalty to the gospel if its intended purpose was to keep peace.⁴³

From an historical perspective, the imperative for peacemaking in Christianity has been organized into four church-state relational configurations:⁴⁴

- **The church over against the state:** Non-participation in acts of war and strict adherence to Jesus' commands to "love your enemies" and "to turn the other cheek." Vocational pacifism applies to persons who follow the ethic Jesus, e.g., Dr. Martin L. King, Jr. (U.S. nonviolent civil disobedience) and Mahatma Gandhi (nonviolent India Freedom Movement).
- **The church in unity with the state:** A wedding of the peace ethic with the core values of the nation. The civil power of the state becomes obedient to the religious authority of the church, e.g., the institution of the Holy Roman Empire by Charlemagne in 800 in 800 AD The prophetic mission of the church for peace and social justice may be compromised.
- **The church separate from but parallel to the state:** The social expectation that the gospel of Christ be essentially nonpolitical. The prophetic voice of the church defers to the political order.
- **The church in judgement on the state:** The contemporary view that the core mandate of the church is to call for spiritual and social accountability for global human dignity, social justice, equal rights, and basic welfare.

Finally, four strategies for peace, relevant to other religions, are identified in Christianity:⁴⁵

- Denounce national idolatry as a barrier to the global recognition of human dignity and denounce the national arrogance of non-self defensive or assisted aggressive war.
- Peace mandates the inclusion of a social strategy for the nonviolent transformation of the conditions of socio-economic and racial oppression.

- Peace means that humanity, as nature's caretakers, applies wisdom to enhance, protect and develop global resources of clean soil, air, and water.
- Religion should stress that the sovereignty of humanity transcends the sovereignty of a given nation.

This section has explored some of the sanctions for peace which are embedded in the theological elements of many of the world religions. The next section will explore some of the ethical problems of terrorism and the place of peacemaking as a counter force.

Understanding Terrorism

Terrorism can be seen as an opposite polarity to peacemaking. Several operational definitions clearly identify how terrorism, in its various forms, would undermine the prospects and processes of peacemaking. As a phenomenon, terrorism has been usefully defined as,

...a planned campaign of paramilitary types of action which is characterized by episodic violence against random targets in order to injure and terrify ordinary people for political purposes while seeking to avoid military confrontation with governmental forces.⁴⁶

Moreover, terrorism is a kind of war, which applies the technique of terror to “strive by force to impose the movement’s will upon other people either within a single political state or across state boundaries.”⁴⁷ Also, like war, terrorism can be understood as having a strategic goal and objective. Father LaCroix, author of *War and International Ethics*, succinctly describes the aim and purpose as follows:

The strategic aim of terrorism as defined here is to unsettle the everyday life of society by destroying those habitual expectations necessary for getting on with ordinary affairs. The purpose of this strategy is to symbolize and publicize (taking credit) the intrusion of the terrorist movement into the relation between the fundamental adequacy of the political order and the everyday life of the people.⁴⁸

The above assessment of terrorism seems to imply that terrorism resembles war in that it is designed to achieve a degree of social disruption via some form of destructive force. Terrorism also has a profound and often adverse impact on domestic mood and opinion. Terrorism also generates confusion. Ultimately, when terrorism gravely affects social welfare, it becomes an instrument of political intrusion with larger implications. As a kind of political warfare, terrorism often mirrors the hostile affect and the hostile intentions of its subjects.

Terrorism can be viewed as anti-peacemaking. Terrorism is antithetical to diplomacy, mediation and negotiation. Thus, terrorism becomes an opposite polarity to peacemaking efforts that may strive to settle disputes peacefully and resolve the underlying issues that lead to conflict.

Terrorism can also be understood as an historical phenomenon. Mao Zedung apparently rejected terrorism, i.e., “random tactical violence against non-governmental targets.”⁴⁹ The following description reflects these tactical roots of terrorism:

Even though the tactics of episodic violence have long been associated with war actions by “irregulars,” guerrillas, and assassins, in the second half of the twentieth century the strategy which employs almost exclusively the use of these tactics has become a new species of war. This new way of war takes to an extreme some characteristics of guerrilla war developed out of the thinking and practice of Mao Zedung (as suggested, perhaps, by the insistence of the Sendero Luminoso in Peru that they are Maoists).⁵⁰

From a tactical political warfare perspective, the following two Maoists themes illustrate an outcome for the persistent terrorists:

Mao’s first theme was that fighting for directly political results could sustain guerrillas even though they were numerically and technologically inferior to their military opponents. Such motivation and their occasional political successes would enable the guerrillas to survive until they eventually wore down their opponents and gained their ultimate political goals.

The second theme, joined to the political motivation of the fighters themselves, was the politicization of the general population. The movement deliberately and overtly did things to include the struggle those people who ordinarily would be indifferent or passive bystanders.⁵¹

In our earlier discussion on the expansive, systemic approach of multi-track diplomacy in peacemaking, the web of interconnected actors and elements was emphasized. In a parallel fashion, warfare, in general, and terrorism, specifically, can be viewed as aiming to impact and influence opponents and their living systems:

Wars reflect the age in which they are fought. Both world wars of this century reflected the industrial age. They were wars of production. The Allies ultimately produced and delivered weapons in greater volume than their opponents. Terrorism reflects the postindustrial age. An increasing portion of the economy is now devoted to the creation, collection, retrieval, transfer, and dissemination of information. Political power increasingly rests on the ability to create or control information. Terrorists are primitive psychological warriors in an information war. Terrorism reflects the current age of instant communications and rapid mobility.⁵²

One aspect of preventive diplomacy holds out the hope that efforts can be made to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts. A moral assessment (experimental morality) of terrorism, posits that

We should listen to those engaged in and those affected by various acts to hear what they intend and feel and think. We should enlarge our experience beyond the academic settings of moral theory and professional discussion. What we do not experience ourselves, we should try more often to experience indirectly through literary accounts, reportage, and especially the statements of participants.⁵³

The above assertion allows for a review of the terrorists' belief that their actions are "morally right."

Virginia Held, author of *Rights and Goods: Justifying Social Action*, also addresses the question—"How are unlawful acts of violence morally justifiable?" From her point of view they are justifiable by reference to consequences if they have the following three characteristics:

- 1) They do not lead to additional, more extensive violence;
- 2) They directly and promptly bring about political consequences which are more decisively approved within the political system than the actions were disapproved;
- 3) No effective alternative means of bringing about these consequences were possible.⁵⁴

Responsible peacemaking needs to recognize how “terrorism may be justified as a part of an ideological ‘program of revolutionary’ struggle analogous to the justification of certain wars.”⁵⁵ Although terrorists vary, many “claim the ‘moral high ground’ and...think of themselves as heroes in an epic battle against evil forces and appeal to ideals and goals that often are culturally idiosyncratic or employ formal terms (e.g., ‘justice’).”⁵⁶

Finally, from the point of view of positive peacemaking, “terrorist acts may be considered analogous to a conditional approval of any war by the just war tradition.”⁵⁷

Based on the normal political methodology of ethical assessment, Held argues that,

We might conclude that if war can be justified, terrorist acts can be also, if they have certain characteristics. But if terrorism includes, not by definition but in fact, the unnecessary killing of the innocent, it is at least not more justified than war in doing so, though the scale may be smaller. And if comparable good results can be accomplished with far less killing, an alternative to war that would achieve these results through acts intrinsically no worse than those that occur in war would be more justifiable....

We might agree that the causing of war, whether through aggression, violent repression, the extermination or expulsion of unwanted populations, or by depriving people of the means to maintain life, is the ultimate crime of violence. If war to prevent the success of those whose cause of war can be justified, lesser uses of terror and violence can also, sometimes be justified.⁵⁸

Summary

This chapter has explored some of the theological and spiritual foundations for peacemaking. A broad spectrum of peacemaking approaches was defined and sorted. Also, four representative religions were surveyed and I noted that peacemaking often overlooks the powerful impact of belief and faith-orientation.

Moreover, peacemaking is, appropriately, a theological issue, mandating disciplined reflection and moral conversation. It is clear that most major religious communities have addressed the dynamic realities of war and violence, as well as the sanctions for peace and peacemaking. Therefore, peacemaking is influenced by godly belief systems.

Finally, understanding war and all of its variants, including religiously-based terrorism, is an important resource for seeking new approaches for fostering trust, better understanding, enhanced living environments, and redemptive relations among nations and their peacemakers.

Notes

¹ W. Fred Cottrell, *Research for Peace Essays* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1954), 99.

² *Joint Task Force Commander's Handbook for Peace Operations*. 1995.

³ *An Agenda for Peace* (New York, N.Y.: United Nations Publications, 1995), 45.

⁴ Brooks L. Bash, *The Role of United States Air Power in Peacekeeping* (Maxwell Air Force Base, AL.: Air University Press, 1994), 6.

⁵ Jack Child, "Peacekeeping, Confidence-building," in Richard L. Millett and Michael Gold-Biss, eds., *Beyond Praetorianism: The Latin American Military in Transition* (Miami: North-South Center Press, 1995), 12.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid., 13-14.

⁸ Louise Diamond and John McDonald, *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace* (Connecticut: Kumarian Press Books, 1996), 4-5.

⁹ Ibid., 1.

¹⁰ Ibid., 1-2.

¹¹ Ibid., 12-13.

¹² Ibid., 13.

Notes

¹³ Homer Jack, ed., *World Religions and World Peace: The International Symposium on Peace* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), 43.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid., 44.

¹⁷ Ibid., 44-45.

¹⁸ Ibid., 45.

¹⁹ Ibid., 46-47.

²⁰ Ibid., 48.

²¹ Ibid., 51.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid., 52.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid., 53.

²⁷ Ibid., 54.

²⁸ Ibid., 54.

²⁹ Ibid., 56.

³⁰ Ibid., 62-63.

³¹ Ibid., 63.

³² Ibid., 65.

³³ Ibid., 68.

³⁴ Ibid., 70.

³⁵ Ibid., 72.

³⁶ Ibid., 74.

³⁷ Ibid., 100.

³⁸ Ibid., 101.

³⁹ Ibid., 102.

⁴⁰ James H. Toner, *The Sword and the Cross: Reflections on Command and Conscience* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1992), 9.

⁴¹ Ibid., 9. See citation from Reinhold Niebuhr, *Christian Realism and Political Problems* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), p. 130.

⁴² Homer Jack, *World Religion and World Peace*, 102.

⁴³ Ibid., 103.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 104-106.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 106-107.

⁴⁶ Wilfred L. LaCroix, *War and International Ethics: Tradition and Today* (Maryland: University Press of America, 1988), 281.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 283.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 282.

⁵¹ Ibid.

Notes

⁵² Ibid., 284. (See citation from Brian Michael Jenkins, “New Modes of Conflict,” *Orbis* 28 (1984), 10-11).

⁵³ Ibid., 285. (See citation from Virginia Held, “Violence, Terrorism, and Moral Inquiry,” *Monist* 67 (1984), 623.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 286.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 288.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 282.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid. (See citation from Held, “Violence, Terrorism, and Moral Inquiry,” 620.)

Chapter 3

Religious Leadership Factors

O mankind! . . . we made you into nations and tribes that you may know and cooperate with one another.

—Koran 49:13

The weakness of the nation are due to our frantic and nostalgic yearning after the original simplicities, for the sake of fleeing or avoiding present complexities.

Reinhold Niebuhr
Theologian and Author

One of the primary aims of religion is to provide organizing and unifying life principles. In essence religion aids a society to ground its core beliefs. One of the challenges of religion is to address the historical, present, and future welfare of the nation-state where it resides. This chapter will address the role of religion in statecraft, as well as the moral legitimacy for religious engagement in strategic global planning for peacemaking.

Religion and International Affairs

In regard to religion and statecraft, some political scientists contend that religion is “best left at the border’s edge.” In essence, religion is seen as a complicating factor.

Barry Rubin, international affairs scholar, believes that it is erroneous to view religion as a devalued element in global politics. He asserts the following premise:

United States foreign policy in recent decades has often misread the importance of religion as a factor in the national and international behavior of some countries and regions. This has sometimes led to incorrect analysis and erroneous policy responses that have proven quite costly.¹

Rubin also identifies several arguments to correct these distortions:

...Religion should be seen as a central political pillar maintaining the power of any ruler—a major pole in determining the people's loyalty—and as a key ingredient in determining a nation's stability or instability.

The expectation that religion would inevitably decline in the process of Third World modernization was wrong.

The West—including the communist regimes—tended to misapply Marx's concept, accepted widely in some quarters of the Western intellectual tradition, that religion is the opiate of the masses.²

In clarifying the social function of religion, Moses Hess, a Karl Marx cohort, seems to see religion as more than a drug or an aversion. He says,

The people, as the Scriptures say, have to work in the sweat of their brows in order to maintain their lives of misery....Such a people, we maintain, needs religion: it is as much a vital necessity for its broken heart as gin is vital for its empty stomach. There is no irony more cruel than that of those who demand from utterly desperate people to be clear-headed and happy....Religion can turn the miserable consciousness of enslavement into a bearable one by raising it to state of absolute despair, in which there disappears any reaction against evil and with it pain disappears as well: just as opium does serve maladies.³

Finally, in a dramatic and descriptive analysis, Rubin argues for the central role that religion plays in international affairs. He contends,

To neglect religious institutions and thinking would be to render incomprehensible some of the key issues and crises in the world today...

The triumph of Islamic fundamentalism could destroy alliances and create new crises...

The political manifestations of Christianity and of Catholicism, in particular, have changed from a major force against change into a factor favoring the attainment of democracy and social justice through reformist or revolutionary means...

A few decades ago, the highest foreign commitment of the United States went to a little country called South Vietnam led by President Ngo Dinh Diem. United States citizens were startled to see Buddhist monks burning themselves in graphic protest against the Diem regime, but these events proved to be the starting point for public opposition to official U.S. engagement in Vietnam and to the instability that would overthrow Diem and help stabilize his success...

More recently, (a) a religiously inspired revolution in Iran unexpectedly took power and followed an unpredictable course, (b) U.S. military forces suffered their single largest loss since Vietnam from a fundamentalist car bomber in Beirut, and (c) Christian-led movements brought democracy to the Philippines and South Korea—all of which posed issues for quick and difficult decision making by U.S. policymakers.⁴

This section has outlined several significant reasons why and how religion should be considered a prominent factor in U.S. foreign policy and international affairs. In this next section, the moral and spiritual values that affirm religious participation in foreign policy and international relations will be discussed.

Religious Authority and Moral Sensitivity

Peacemaking at the international level requires professional knowledge, skill, and sensitivity. Foreign policy engagement requires a keen and dynamic understanding of global dynamics and strategic policy concerns. If these are understood as basic requirements, by what authority does religion have to be considered a legitimate actor in this process?

The imperatives for religious “voice” have been well outlined by John C. Bennett, a presenter at the 1966 National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace, along the following six areas:

1. Religious actors are obligated to focus concern on the immediate human impact of policy decisions.
2. Establishing policy goals involves moral decision-making. Moral goals address long term national security concerns and are as follows:
 - 1) the prevention of war and especially the prevention of the escalation of any conflict into general nuclear war; 2) the preservation of as wide an area as possible of openness in the world in which nations have freedom to choose their own social systems, in which there is diversity and mutual respect among those who choose diverse paths; 3) the helping of nations that are struggling against hunger and poverty to achieve justice and access to plenty and to do so in their way and not necessarily in our way; 4) support for the United States and development of its function to enable nations to find security and multilateral substitutes for the present arms race, to extend the rule of law among nations and encourage mutual confidence and human relations between them.
3. Moral actors have the right to raise questions about the means employed to achieve strategic national security objectives.
4. Moral actors have some responsibility to assist American citizens in seeing the world from the perspective of the people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.
5. Religious actors, as non-specialist and non-military experts can offer different assumptive perspectives and social analysis to the problems of social and international conflict.
6. Religious actors should assist in the appropriate critique of distorted uses of religion, e.g., the psychology of the “holy war” or assignment of the word “honor” to our national strategy.⁵

Finally, from the perspective of history, “organized religion has been the chief home and defender of morality in statecraft as in other social and cultural realms.”⁶

One of the challenges of applying a faith perspective, particularly Christianity, to collective context of international and global needs is the reality that “the Christian who

is enjoined to love his neighbor man to man discovers that he must channel his love through an administrative case load.”⁷ Moreover, the following description, though Christian-oriented, could apply to the United States in its socially responsible peacemaking, as well as military operations other than war (MOOTW):

To put it briefly, the purpose of Christian love in the [twentieth] century is to maintain [a] constant tension between the final object of social therapy (who is a person) and the methods (which are a system). The is that organized social action will rest content with routines and procedures and settle for aid and comfort to single form of social need. New forms of poverty arise, and the Christian must be the prophetic voice who speaks for mankind in all conditions and needs His antennae must be alert to new forms of cruelty and violence.⁸

Ultimately, a superpower like the United States will face the increased taxing of its moral strength and economic and military resources in response to the world’s domestic violence calls (911) or, what has been more officially described as “low-intensity conflict.”⁹

Summary

To review, religion plays a key role in international relations. Moreover, without becoming morally self-righteous, religious actors have the moral authority to assert moral sensitivity into the discussion regarding national and international security goals and priorities. Peacemaking is not for the weak, the naïve, or the faint-hearted, but it does require compassion, conviction, conscience, and competence. The following chapter will explore a framework for peacemaking and paradoxical values of peacemaking.

Notes

¹ Barry Rubin, “Religion and International Affairs,” in Douglas Johnston and Cynthia Sampson, eds., *Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 20.

² *Ibid.*, 20-21.

Notes

³ Ibid. (See citation from Shlomo Avineri, *Moses Hess: Prophet of Communism and Zionism* (New York: New York University Press, 1987), 102.

⁴ Ibid., 33-34.

⁵ John C. Bennett, "Issue of Peace: The Voice of Religion," in Homer A. Jack, ed., *Religion and Peace: Papers from the National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966), 39-43.

⁶ Kenneth W. Thompson, *The Moral Issue in Statecraft: Twentieth-Century Approaches & Problems* (New Orleans: Louisiana State University Press, 1966), 116.

⁷ Ibid., 123.

⁸ Ibid., 123-124.

⁹ Michael T. Klare, "Low-Intensity Conflict: A Growing Threat to Peace," in Linda R. Forcey, ed., *Peace: Meanings, Politics, Strategies* (New York: Praeger, 1989).

Chapter 4

Bridges for Peace and Conflict Resolution

The preamble of UNESCO which proclaims that, since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace should be built, it is fundamentally a religious proposition.

—Swami Ranganathananda

A Framework for Peace

In describing his significant research addressing conflict transformation across cultures of Latin America, the Philippines, Cambodia, Asia, Somalia, Africa and America, John Paul Lederach, Eastern Mennonite University Professor of Sociology and Conflict Studies and Director of the International Conciliation Service of the Mennonite Central Committee, says that “...the sociological laws of conflict are played out in predictable fashion regardless of the field, discipline, or people involved. Peacemakers are no exception.”¹

Expanding upon the significant conceptual work of Adam Curle, the Quaker conciliator and author of *Making Peace* (1971), Lederach formulates a framework that compares the conflict and transformation processes of nonviolent activism and mediation (see Table 1, below).²

Table 1 – Conflict Transformation: A Comparison

NONVIOLENT ACTIVISM		MEDIATION
• With One Side	1. STANCE	• Connected To All Sides
• Increased Overt Expression • Understanding Of Conflict • Reduce Violence	2. METHOD	• Increased Mutual Understanding • Reduce Adversariness
• Speak Truth	3. EMPHASIS	• Hear Truth
• Silence Awareness Recognition Interdependence =	4. PROCESS	• Awareness Of Dialogue To Mutual Solutions =
• Social Change And Increased Justice Through Peaceful Means	5. GOAL	• Social Change And Increased Justice Through Peaceful Means

Noting two key ideas from Curle’s approach, Lederach says,

First, the framework suggests that education, advocacy, and mediation shares the goal of change and restructuring unpeaceful relationships. They share the vision, of substantive and procedural change...

Second, we note that these peacemaking activities overlap, complement, and, more importantly, are mutually supportive and dependent. Negotiation becomes possible when the needs and interests of all those involved and affected by the conflict are legitimated and articulated...

It is worth noting where these roles differ. Advocacy, for example, chooses to stand by one side for justice’s sake. Mediation chooses to stand in connection to all sides for justice’s sake. Nonviolent advocacy, given the circumstances, pursues confrontation by moving to produce and increase the overt expression of conflict, while seeking to reduce violence.³

Given the assumptions of this very clear framework, it seems that the role of religious actors and faith issues would need to be explicit and circumspect. For example, the values of a particular organization may drive or instruct its particular religious mediator to “advocate” for a given “justice” concern.

Finally, if religion is to be considered a viable bridge for peacemaking and conflict resolution in the international arena then it must be willing to recognize the fact that,

Transformation suggests a dynamic understanding that conflict can move in destructive or constructive directions, but proposes an effort to

maximize the achievement of constructive, mutually beneficial processes and outcomes.⁴

The following section will highlight four paradoxes, which are connected to values in peacemaking.

Paradoxical Values of Peacemaking

Lederach has usefully distilled four approaches that feature paradoxical values to peacemaking. The first paradoxical value (*The Freire Folly: Personal and Social Change*) is based on the work of author Paulo Freire, which focuses on “conscientization, awareness of self in context, a concept that simultaneously promotes personal and social transformation.”⁵

The second paradoxical value (*Micah’s Dilemma: The Paradox of Justice and Mercy*) is based on the prophetic tasks of doing justice, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God. In short,

Doing justice is the pursuit of restoration, of rectifying wrongs, of creating right relationships based on equity and fairness. Pursuing justice involves advocacy for those harmed, for open acknowledgement of wrongs committed and making things right.

Mercy, on the other hand, involves compassion, forgiveness, and a new start. Mercy is oriented toward supporting the persons who have committed injustices, encouraging them to change and move on.⁶

The third paradoxical value (*The Power Paradox: Empowerment and Interdependence*) is based on 1) “overcoming the obstacles and making possible the movement from ‘I cannot’ to ‘I can’ and 2) mutual dependence...I can is only fully accomplished with ‘I need you’.”⁷

The fourth paradoxical value (*The Gandhi Dilemma: The Paradox of Processes and Outcomes*)

...invites us to embrace process as a way of life that takes seriously the means by which we pursue our goals. It is undergirded by the values of participation, cooperation, and respect for others, even our enemies,

and

...it invites us to an ongoing commitment to Truth and restoration of relationships as the ultimate measure of sustainable outcomes.⁸

Summary

To recapitulate, this chapter discussed a framework for peacemaking and conflict resolution focusing upon the common objective of social change and restructuring unpeaceful relationships. In addition, transformative peacemaking is built upon the four paradoxical values of personal and social transformation, justice and mercy, empowerment and interdependence, and attention to process and outcomes in relationship restoration. The next chapter will identify a number of key peacemaking capabilities that can flow from the unique spiritual and religious postures of faith-oriented actors.

Notes

¹ John P. Lederach, *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 11.

² Ibid., 13-15.

³ Ibid., 14-15.

⁴ Ibid., 19.

⁵ Ibid., 19.

⁶ Ibid., 20.

⁷ Ibid., 21.

⁸ Ibid., 22.

Chapter 5

Core Competencies in Faith-Based Peacemaking and Global Ministry in the 21st Century

If the great religions continue to waste their energies in fratricidal struggle, instead of regarding themselves as friendly partners in the supreme task of fostering the spiritual life of mankind, then no further obstacle will stand in the way of the rapid advance of moral materialism.

--Former President S. Radhakrishnan
Author

Chaplain as Peacemaker and Consultant

The epigraph cited above highlights several vital challenges. The questions are broad, yet specific. Can religiously motivated “agents” function as “chaplains” in the complex, global context?

One of the first tasks in this regard is to *recognize the divisiveness* that has often been imported and sanctioned by the religious community. However, as discussed in the sanctions for peace, within many faith communities “there is a high degree of cooperation, mutual respect, and ecumenism and an active spirit of healing.”¹

The symbolic function of the chaplain is that of “spiritual broker.” The chaplain *represents and communicates the essential spiritual values* that should pervade the individual and institutional lives of the system that he or she serves.

Moreover, chaplains are expected to *command a generalist knowledge of the basic faith tenets and ultimate values* of the “players” and “vital issues” in a given conflict arena.

Spiritual leadership in peacemaking will involve many common activities, such as education, research, informal dialogue and conflict mediation, and advocacy. However, more uniquely,

...it engages in prayer and mediation as major tools of its work, it offers sanctuary to refugees, it raises ethical questions about national policy, it has an extensive presence through nongovernmental organizations, it offers training and education in nonviolence, and it offers its work through mission service and community involvement.²

In a general sense, the chaplain, as a symbolic representation of peacemaker, *embodies spiritual and moral reality*.

Fostering friendly, spiritual partnership is vital in Multi-Track diplomacy. The following statement describes this work:

Interfaith dialogue and joint projects are an important aspect of the work of this community, as is religion-based travel and citizen exchange. In fact, much of its work has to do in one way or another with bringing people together to transcend their differences. It has widespread, established networks that are not often involved in the work of other tracks. In some cases, it provides extensive unofficial conflict resolution and conciliation services that never come to public attention. It works deeply with economic and social development issues, as well as political issues.³

Religiously motivated consultants or peacemaking chaplains, who would dare offer themselves as advisors, observers or cultural liaisons in contexts of regional or international conflict, need to *possess a deep, wisdom (dynamic understanding) concerning a framework for the causes of war*.⁴

Finally, the chaplain as a peacemaker needs to possess the capacity to *creatively integrate and constructively interpret the elements of faith, hope, and security*.

Understanding the nonmilitary aspects of security from a systems perspective is essential for the faith advocate who desires to be effective in international peacemaking. The following definition was adopted by consensus by 150 representatives at the International Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, called by the United Nations General Assembly in New York, August 24 to September 11, 1987:

Recently, nonmilitary threats to security have moved to the forefront of global concern. Underdevelopment and declining prospects for development, as well as mismanagement and waste of resources, constitute challenges to security. The degradation of the environment presents a threat to sustainable development. The world can hardly be regarded as secure so long as there is a polarization of wealth and poverty at the national and international levels. Gross and systematic violations of human rights retard genuine socio-economic development and create tensions which contribute to instability. Mass poverty, illiteracy, disease, squalor and malnutrition afflicting a large proportion of the world's population often become the cause of social strain, tension, and strife.⁵

In addition, the following operational definition of security was formulated by a group of professionals discussing the nonmilitary aspects of security while meeting in Tashkent in May 1990:

Security is a condition in which states consider that there is no danger of military attack, political pressure or economic coercion, so that they are able to pursue freely their own development and progress.

The security of individuals and communities of which states are constituted is ensured by the guarantee and effective exercise of individual freedom, political, social and economic rights, as well as by the preservation or restoration of a livable environment for present and future generations.

Security also implies that essential human needs, notably in the field of nutrition, education, housing and public health are ensured on a permanent basis.

An adequate protection against dangers to security should also be maintained.

The ways and means to attain security may be defined in national, intergovernmental, non-governmental or global terms.⁶

The viable potential of the chaplain/religious consultant providing a mediating perspective to the cause of peacemaking is affirmed by an historic joint declaration made in 1970 in Kyoto, Japan at the first World Conference on Religion and Peace, which included 250 senior leaders representing 10 major world religions from 40 different countries. The deliberations of this group affirmed the following elements of moral common ground:

- A conviction of fundamental unity of the human family, and the equality and dignity of all human beings
- A sense of the sacredness of the individual person and his or her conscience
- A sense of the value of human community
- A realization that might is not right; that human power is not self-sufficient and absolute
- A belief that love, compassion, selflessness, and the force of inner truthfulness and of the spirit have ultimately greater power than hate, enmity, and self-interest
- A sense of obligation to stand on the side of the oppressed as against the oppressor
- A profound hope that good will prevail⁷

Thus, the final core competency for faith-based peacemaking is *persistent commitment to the hope of finding moral common ground*.

The next section will explore some of the broader roles and functions of religiously-oriented “agents” in peacemaking.

Roles for Religiously-Oriented Agents

What are some of the unique potential roles that religious-oriented actors (individuals, communities, organizations, and institutions) play in peacemaking efforts?

Religious actors exist at many levels in communities around the world. Thus, the potential for religious contributions to peacemaking exists at the local, national, regional, and international level. Some of the broader possibilities for peacemaking agents have been well documented and are listed as follows:

- International ecumenical body (e.g., the World Council of Churches)
- International denominational organization (e.g., the Vatican)
- National ecumenical body (e.g., the South African Council of Churches)
- National denominational group (e.g., the Evangelische Kirche in East Germany)
- National nondenominational group (e.g. Moral Re-Armament in Rhodesia)
- Ad hoc ecumenical group (e.g. the Conciliation Commission in Nicaragua)
- Individual representing a denomination or religious tradition (e.g., Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu in South Africa)
- Individual acting independently (e.g., prayer fellowship member General David Jones in the Kenya-Somalia dispute).⁸

The function of peacemaking agents is varied and diverse. These functions will be briefly identified. First, religious agents can function as *activists*. This means, “they function as activists (parties to the conflict) working as a force for nonviolent change or in support of an emerging political consensus.”⁹ Secondly, religious agents can function as *advocates*. As advocates (parties in support of one side in a conflict) serve by “providing sanctuary for internal opposition groups, engaging in truth-telling, or applying pressure from outside the political system.”¹⁰

In terms of third-party roles, religious agents can also perform “*peace process advocacy, opening lines of communication between the parties in conflict, conciliation, and mediation, observers,... enforcers or guarantors, of some aspect of a political settlement.*”¹¹

The pursuit of peacemaking by religious communities also requires several prerequisite steps. The key elements in this preparation are as follows:

1. Internal reflection and self-criticism regarding religious meanings and practices are necessary first steps.
2. Next comes an examination and adjustment of the tradition’s forms of practice in relation to peacemaking.
3. Finally, there should be a wide dissemination of the tradition’s peace-oriented teachings to its members and a purposeful effort to educate and train them in the art and science of conflict resolution.¹²

Finally, religious oriented actors can enhance their readiness to engage in peacemaking by understanding a psychosocial dynamic model, i.e., “interactions between an individual’s needs and the social relationships that satisfy them.”¹³ According to Breggin, author and psychiatrist, “the three psychosocial dynamics correspond to the three basic needs: love, liberty, and coercion.”¹⁴ He elaborates upon these three psychosocial dynamics in the following two scenarios:

If a father, for example, has a conflict with a son, he has three basic options. He can force a solution on his child (coercion), he can create an environment in which his son has as much choice as possible (liberty), or he can solve the problem in a loving manner aimed at satisfying his son’s basic needs (love). Or the father may try a mixture of all three approaches.

Similarly, if a nation is planning a strategy for handling an international conflict, it again has three basic options—love, liberty, or coercion—and again, the outcome will be greatly affected by its choices. The nation can threaten war (coercion), seek to negotiate through diplomatic channels (liberty), or offer to collaborate with the adversary toward mutual satisfaction of each side’s basic needs (love).¹⁵

A summary of the key principles of each of the three dynamics is listed in Table 2, below.¹⁶

Table 2 – Understanding the Three Dynamics

LOVE (DYNAMIC I)	LIBERTY (DYNAMIC II)	COERCION (DYNAMIC III)
1. Nurturing, sharing, and giving gifts 2. Cooperative relationships 3. The generation of feelings of empathy, caring, and love 4. The abhorrence and rejection of force.	1. Bargaining, negotiating, or making voluntary exchanges 2. Competitive relationships 3. The generation of feelings of respect or esteem 4. Force limited to self-defense	1. Forcing, threatening, bullying, and manipulating 2. Involuntary or oppressive relationships 3. The generation of negative feelings, such as hate, guilt, shame, anxiety, numbing, and chronic anger (These feelings will be identified as expressions of psychological helplessness.) 4. The arbitrary use of force

In essence, “the three dynamic approach encompasses all the ways human beings try to resolve their conflicts.”¹⁷ The personal and political implication of each dynamic is represented in the following respective statements:

- Love generates personal bonding and human community.
- Liberty generates autonomy and the free market.
- Coercion generates personal oppression and totalitarianism.¹⁸

Summary

To review, this chapter has discussed some of the essential capabilities that will likely characterize faith-based peacemaking in the twenty-first century. Peacemaking from a faith-oriented perspective can be understood broadly as a kind of global “chaplaincy” or faith consultation. Core competencies vital to peacemaking include: recognizing divisiveness within the religious community; representing and communicating essential spiritual values; commanding a generalist knowledge of basic faith tenets and ultimate values of the “players”; embodying spiritual and moral reality; fostering friendly spiritual partnership; possessing a dynamic understanding of the causes of war; creatively integrating and constructively interpreting the elements of faith, hope, and security; and persistently committing energies toward finding moral common ground. Religiously oriented actors or agents include individuals, communities, organizations, and institutions that can serve at various levels as activists, advocates, mediators, enforcers, and guarantors. Ultimately, religious actors in the peacemaking process need to possess the skill and sensitivity to utilize the three psychosocial dynamics (love, liberty, and coercion) to diverse challenges.

Notes

¹ Diamond and McDonald, *Multi-Track Diplomacy*, 99.

² Ibid., 100.

³ Ibid., 100.

⁴ Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War* (New York: The Free Press, 1988), 292-294. Several relevant causes are listed here: 1) If it is true that the breakdown of diplomacy leads to war, it is also true that the breakdown of war leads to diplomacy; 2) While the breakdown of diplomacy reflects the belief of each nation that it will gain more by fighting than by negotiating, the breakdown of war reflects the belief of each nation that it will gain more by negotiating than by fighting; 3) War and peace appear to share the same framework of causes. The same set of factors should appear in explanations of the outbreak of war; widening of war by entry of new nations; outbreak of peace; surmounting crises during a period of peace; and of course, the ending of peace; 4) When leaders of rival nations have to decide whether to begin, continue or end a war, they are, consciously or unconsciously, asking variations of the same question: they are assessing their ability of inability to impose their will on the rival nation.

⁵ Dietrich Fischer, *Nonmilitary Aspects of Security: A Systems Approach* (Vermont: Dartmouth Publishing, 1993), 10.

⁶ Ibid., 10.

⁷ William Vendley and David Little, "Implications for Religious Communities: Buddhism, Islam, Hinduism, and Christianity," in *Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*, eds., Douglas Johnson and Cynthia Sampson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 313-314.

⁸ Ibid., 312-313.

⁹ Ibid., 313.

¹⁰ Ibid., 313.

¹¹ Ibid., 313.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Peter R. Breggin, *Beyond Conflict: From Self-Help and Psychotherapy to Peacemaking* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992), 6.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid., 6-7.

¹⁶ Ibid., 7.

¹⁷ Ibid., 8.

¹⁸ Ibid.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

In history, great crimes have been committed in the name of religions, directly or indirectly by those who professed to believe in them and by those who were supposed to be their custodians.

--K. G. Saiyadian
Islamic Scholar

Implications of the Religious Voice in Proactive Global Diplomacy

This exploration began with the assumption that religious differences have contributed significantly to the initiation and the execution of social conflict and war. Also, this discussion has sought avenues to identify and clarify the ways and means religious actors can support peacemaking and conflict-resolution strategies.

According to Former President Jimmy Carter, “personal experience underlies my conviction that religion can be a significant factor for peacemaking.”¹ The mediation process in the 1978 Camp David Summit with Menachen Begin and Anwar el-Sadat included vital elements: preliminary prayer; daily separate worship; respect for personal, historical, religious, and political convictions; and a recognition of peace as a gift from God as well as an imperative for humankind.² Carter’s role in the Arab-Israeli negotiations confirm the notion that peacemaking is a theological and global security imperative.

Moreover, one reason given for Carter's effective diplomatic work with these polarized leaders was—"Carter's overall loving attitude."³ As a powerful leader with very clear religious motivation, Carter humbly and skillfully engaged these hostile parties. Carter's wise "manipulation" also included war cost data, good intentions, political pressure, and financial inducement by the U.S.⁴ One assessment of the outcome concludes,

When a third party, such as Carter, intervenes in a conflict, love creates and motivates the forum for conflict resolution. Problem solving then takes place within the caring context created by the intervener. Ultimately, valued and even loving relationships frequently emerge from the work of getting to know and to understand each other.⁵

Involving the religious dimension in Track One and Multi-Track diplomacy has not gone uncriticized. For example, "former President Jimmy Carter's efforts at peacemaking in various 'hot spots' are often treated with some degree of scorn by other politicians and the press."⁶ Similarly, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was hailed as a peacemaker and human rights leader in America, was also condemned for giving "voice" to issues of peace with social and economic justice in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Dr. King's belief that local justice was linked to global justice is seen in his assertion—"Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."⁷ He recognized that peacemaking in a local context ultimately translates into the global arena. With a moral "voice" he says,

They applaud us in the sit-in movement when we nonviolently decided to sit in at lunch counters. They applauded us on freedom rides when we accepted blows without retaliation. They praised us in...Birmingham and Selma, Alabama. Oh, the press was so noble in its applause and...praise when I would say "Be nonviolent towards Bull Connor,"..."Be nonviolent toward Jim Clark.." There is something strangely inconsistent about a nation and a press that would praise you when you say," Be nonviolent toward little brown Vietnamese children!"⁸

The role of religious and spiritual leadership factors and actors will also have profound implications for future proactive global diplomacy and peacemaking. First of all, as the world re-configures (new-world order), faith-oriented leadership should purposefully and assertively focus on *positive rather than negative peace*. In the face of shifting paradigms, strategic religious leadership must bring the power of its cultural insights and its moral integrity to any and all consultations for peace conflict resolution. Religious leadership is not acting beyond its values and parameters when it calls for global “collectivity and unity.” The implications of engaging emerging and future external issues means we go beyond an isolationist point of view in order to,

...See a greater need for cooperation and collaboration, for collective mechanisms of discussion, negotiation, decision making, peacemaking, economic development and trade, scientific resource sharing, problem solving, environmental action, arms control, and international law and finance.⁹

Also, fostering respect for global ethnic diversity is emerging to the point that,

...We find ethnic groups rising up to demand that their own identities be politically recognized...What we once thought of as nations (Iraq, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia, Sudan, India) turn out to be conglomerations of ethnic religious, or tribal factions whose actions indicate that they no longer wish to be associated. These groups have, in many cases been repressed or oppressed by ruling factions and will not stand for it any longer. They demand recognition of their basic identity and are increasingly willing to fight for it.¹⁰

Second, as the democratization process flows through Eastern Europe, Africa, South and Central America, and the Middle East, the current repertoires of statecraft will be stretched.¹¹ The understanding of religious factors can provide an additional window into assessing the strength of political and social structures, as well as providing insight into the morale and mood of its citizens. Official U.S. intelligence reporting may often gather

“facts,” but misread their meaning or define them in simplistic terms if religious factors are ignored.

Third, the inclusion of the religious voice in the diplomatic process means using a time-tested force of social identity and a respected set of values to aide in the navigation through the new post-Cold War era regional, subregional, intrastate identity-group conflicts. In long-term conflict situations involving cyclical violence, gross human rights abuses, reactive and revenge violence, religiously motivated leadership can offer a “new language” to make steps toward a peacemaking process.

Finally, as coercive military force becomes a less plausible option for use in low-intensity and large-scale global conflict, other forms of balances of power may become more attractive and appropriate. Religiously motivated local, regional and national actors could function in vital roles designed to follow through on conflict resolutions, as well as confront new or evolving disputes.

Common Ground for Meaningful Religious Engagement

In this final section, several administrative recommendations will be made concerning how religious leadership factors can contribute in roles other than bridge-builders, religious crisis managers, message couriers, and goodwill social servants.

Functioning as an instrument of peace is risky, consuming, and challenging. Peacemaking involves the judicious and responsible use of the world’s most potent power—moral authority. Moral authority is not necessarily religious, but it is, essentially, spiritual. Spiritual factors involve commitment to values, fundamental beliefs, and ethical principles, and integrity in life purpose.

In the Chapter 5 discussion – “Chaplain as Peacemaker and Consultant”—seven elements of moral common ground were identified from the historic World Conference on Religion and Peace, Kyoto, Japan. This declaration is a useful, viable, and strategic foundation for peacemaking and meaningful religious engagement. Briefly, the elements are: belief in the human unity, equality, and dignity; sacredness of individuals and their conscience; the value of human community; realization that power is not absolute; a belief that love is stronger than hate; an imperative to stand on the side of the oppressed; and a belief that good will endure.

Based on these principles of declaration and the prior discussions focusing on vital religious leadership factors and essential core competencies, future statecraft policy might consider programming to:

1. Assign religion attaches to diplomatic missions in appropriate regions.
2. Foster the presence of religiously motivated actors as local and regional conflict mediators, as well as agreement monitors.
3. Include the psychology of religion and the nature of religious dynamics in the education of U.S. diplomats.
4. Explore the expanded use of religiously motivated citizen diplomats in Track II and Multi-Track diplomacy.
5. Encourage diplomatic missions to take more seriously the importance of religious “intelligence.”
6. Add religious “specialists” to peacemaking operations.
7. Include funding for religious resource consulting in peace-building operations.
8. Increase the utilization of religious agencies, organization and institutions that can serve effectively as cultural brokers and preventive diplomacy liaisons. (See Appendix).¹²
9. Assign chaplain “advisors” to diplomatic missions to foster broader sensitivity to spiritual elements and to the concept and role of religion.

10. Develop a more rigorous mechanism for religious research and analysis.

Finally, the following abstract from *Center for Army Lessons Learned*, “New from the Front” describes the effective contribution of chaplains in peace operations:

Operation Able Sentry, a UN preventive deployment mission in Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM) provides some insight into the positive impact of chaplains in this environment. In this part of the world diverse religions clearly play a significant role in the daily lives of the population. Religion captures the spotlight in the national arena as well.

In FYROM, for example, 60 percent of the population is Greek Orthodox, 25 percent is Muslim, and 2 percent is Roman Catholic. The remainder is splintered among a variety of religions and sects. A task force chaplain’s interaction with the Macedonian Roman Catholic Bishop and local Greek Orthodox priests proved significant in convincing the religious leaders to view the UN mission positively. The calming effect resulting from “telling the UN/US story” proved significant in enhancing both force protection (citizens now view the UN positively) and the overall mission.¹³

Ultimately, this discussion has shown that the influence of religion on peacemaking processes is diverse and pervasive. Moreover, the most effective negotiators are skilled and sensitive and can flexibly engage conflicted perspectives. Archbishop John Q. Quinn, a leading peace Bishop and author, who said—“Let us replace violence and mistrust and hate with confidence and caring,”¹⁴ provides an appropriate conclusion:

Lord, make me an instrument of Your peace.
Where there is hatred, let me sow love.
Where there is injury, pardon;
Where there is doubt, faith;
Where there is despair, hope;
Where there is darkness, light;
Where there is sadness, joy;
O Divine Master, grant that I may seek not so much to be consoled
As to console;
To be understood as to understand;
To be loved as to love;
For it is giving that we receive;
It is in pardoning that we are pardoned; and
It is in dying that we are born to Eternal Life.¹⁵

Notes

¹ Johnston and Sampson, *Religion, The Missing a Dimension of Statecraft*, vii.

² Ibid.

³ Breggin, *Beyond Conflict*, 227.

⁴ Ibid., 228.

⁵ Ibid., 227.

⁶ Diamond and McDonald, *Multi-Track Diplomacy*, 143.

⁷ James H. Cone, "Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Third World," in Luther Martin, ed., *Religious Transformations and Socio-Political Change: Eastern Europe and Latin America* (New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993), 137. (See citation from Pat Watters, *Down to Now: Reflections on the Southern Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971).

⁸ Ibid., 124-125. (See citation from "Why I am opposed to the War in Vietnam," sermon preached at Ebenezer Baptist Church, April 30, 1976. Atlanta, GA.: King Center Archives.

⁹ Diamond and McDonald, *Multi-Track Diplomacy*, 131-132.

¹⁰ Ibid., 132.

¹¹ Ibid., 132.

¹² Ibid., 102-107.

¹³ FM 100-23, *Peace Operations*, December 1994.

¹⁴ George Weigel, *The Peace Bishops and the Arms Race Can Religious Leadership Help in Preventing War?* (Chicago: World Without War Publications, 1982), 15.

¹⁵ Ibid., 15.

Appendix A

List of International Peacemaking Organizations

<p>American Friends Service Committee 1501 Cherry Street Philadelphia, PA 19102 (215) 241-7000</p> <p>Quaker agency which focuses on reconciliation, education, alternatives to violence, refugee aid, and war victims.</p>	<p>Baha'I International Community 866 United Nations Plaza Suite 120 New York, NY 10017-1811 (212) 756-3500</p> <p>A spiritual community dedicated to world unity and peace, and economic justice.</p>	<p>Rabbi Balfour Brickner Stephen Wise Synagogue 30 West Sixty-eighth Street New York, NY 10023 (212) 877-4050</p> <p>Leading cofounder of Clergy and Laity Concerned; Strong role in Jewish social action for peace and justice</p>
<p>Clergy and Laity Concerned 340 Mead Road Decatur, GA 30030</p> <p>Carol Frazier, head staff Broad and diverse peace and justice network dedicated to issues of militarism, economic and racial justice, and human rights.</p>	<p>Fellowship of Reconciliation Box 271 Nyack, NY 10960 (914) 358-4601</p> <p>Contact: Richard Deats International, interfaith organization seeking to build world peace through denominational fellowships.</p>	<p>Foundation for Global Community 222 High Street Palo Alto, CA 94301-1097 (415) 328-7756</p> <p>Foundation dedicated to building a secure future by applying the basic truths of human interdependence, diversity with unity, and nonviolent conflict resolution.</p>
<p>Alan Geyer Wesley Theological Seminary 4500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20016 (202) 885-8600</p> <p>Executive Director of Churches' Center for Theology & Public Policy</p>	<p>Jewish Peace Fellowship (Same address as Fellowship of Reconciliation)</p> <p>Contact: Joyce Bressler Committed to nonviolent social activism to abolish war and create a community to transcend national boundaries.</p>	<p>Martin Luther King Jr . Center for Nonviolent Social Change 449 Auburn Avenue, NE Atlanta, GA 30312 (404) 526-8948 or 1956</p> <p>Dedicated to teaching, interpreting, advocating, and promoting the nonviolent removal of poverty, racism, violence, and war.</p>
<p>Moral Re-Armament, Inc. 1156 Fifteenth St., NW Suite 910 Washington, DC 20005-1704 (202) 872-9077</p> <p>Richard Ruffin, director Worldwide interfaith network focusing on personal change and interpersonal reconciliation.</p>	<p>Maharishi International University 1000 North Fourth Street Fairfield, IA 52557-1026 (515) 472-7493</p> <p>Contact: Pat Robinson, Box 1026 Offers research and theory development in the Maharishi technology of the unified field, a group mediation process to raise collective consciousness for world peace.</p>	<p>Joe Nangle, Executive Assistant Sojourners 2401 Fifteenth Street., NW Washington, DC 20009 (202) 328-8842</p> <p>Ecumenical Bible-based movement seeking to combine faith and political action.</p>

--	--	--

<p>Mennonite Central Committee P.O. Box 500 Akron, PA 17501-0500 (717) 859-3889</p> <p>A voluntary service and relief agency focusing on conflict resolution and global peacemaking.</p>	<p>NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby 801 Pennsylvania Ave., SE Suite 460 Washington, DC 20003 (202) 547-5556</p> <p>Works for just access to economic resources and just global relationships.</p>	<p>Religious Action Center 2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036 (202) 387-2800</p> <p>Mobilizes the D.C. community for social justice and religious liberty.</p>
<p>Corinne McLaughlin and Gordon Davidson Sirius Community 8306 Cathedral Forest Drive Fairfax Station, VA 22039 T: (703) 764-0999 F: (703) 764-5373</p> <p>Co-authors of <i>Builders of the Dawn and Spiritual Politics</i>; teachers of transformation politics.</p>	<p>Soka Gakkai International—USA 4603 Eastern Avenue Mt. Rainier, MD 20712-2407 T: (301) 779-3255 F: (301) 779-4954</p> <p>Contact: Bill Aiken Worldwide agency of Buddhist lay believers dedicated to peace, culture, and education.</p>	<p>Sunray Mediation Society Box 308 Bristol, VT 05443 (802) 453-4610</p> <p>Dhyani Ywahoo, director Brings ancient wisdom on peace and peacemaking to the Etowah Tsalagi (Cherokee) people in public education.</p>
<p>Unitarian Universalist United Nations Office 777 United Nations Plaza, 7D New York, NY 10017 (212) 986-5165</p> <p>Advances ideals of international cooperation and world peace with justice.</p>	<p>Weston Priory 58 Priory Hill Road Weston, VT 05161 (802) 824-5409</p> <p>Contact: Brothers Richard and Philip This Benedictine monastic community sponsors loving and learning retreats for the poor and supports Latin American grassroots groups, as well as African American, Native American, and Appalachian communities.</p>	<p>World Conference on Religion and Peace 777 United Nations Plaza, 9th Floor New York, NY 10017 (212) 687-2163</p> <p>Contact: William Vendley A forum promoting global interreligious encounters, working for peace through justice.</p>

Bibliography

- Air University. *Air University Style Guide for Writers and Editors*, 1996, n.p. On-line. Internet, 4 November 1996. Available from <http://www.au.af.mil/au/rco/style/>.
- Blainey, Geoffrey. *The Causes of War*. New York, NY: The Free Press, 1988.
- Breggin, Peter R. *Beyond Conflict: From Self-Help and Psychotherapy to Peacemaking*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- The Chicago Manual of Style*. 14th ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Child, Jack, "Peacekeeping, Confidence-Building." In *Beyond Praetorianism: The Latin American Military in Transition*. Edited by Richard L. Millett and Michael Gold-Bliss. Miami, FL: North-South Center Press, 1996.
- College of Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education, *AU Press Style Guide for Writers & Editors*. Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, December 1994.
- College of Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education. *AU Press Author Guide*. Maxwell AFB, AL: Air University Press, March 1995.
- Diamond, Louise, and John McDonald. *Multi-Track Diplomacy: A Systems Approach to Peace*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press Books, 1996.
- Fischer, Dietrich. *Nonmilitary Aspects of Security: A Systems Approach*. Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth Publishing Company, 1993.
- Forcey, Linda R. *Peace: Meanings, Politics, Strategies*. New York, NY: Praeger, 1989.
- Geyer, Alan. *The Idea of Disarmament: Rethinking the Unthinkable*. Elgin, IL: Brethren Press, 1982.
- Homer, Jack A., ed. *World Religions and World Peace: The International Symposium on Peace*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1968.
- Homer, Jack A., ed. *Religion and Peace: Papers from the National Inter-Religious Conference on Peace*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966
- Ihrke, Lt Col Paul W. "America's Military-Spiritual Heritage from Genesis to Desert Storm." USAWC Military Studies Program Paper. Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College, 1992.
- Johnston, Douglas and Cynthia Sampson, eds., *Religion, The Missing Dimension of Statecraft*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- LaCroix, Wilfred L. *War and International Ethics: Tradition and Today*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988.
- Lederach, John P. *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1995
- Leslie, LCDR, CHC Reo N. "The Sacred and the Sword: A Study of How Religions View War." Newport, RI: Unpublished paper from Naval War College, 1990.
- Long, Edward Leroy, Jr. *Peace Thinking in a Warring World: An Urgent Call for a New Approach to Peace*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1983.

- Thompson, Kenneth W. *The Moral Issue in Statecraft: Twentieth-Century Approaches & Problems*. New Orleans, LA: Louisiana State University, 1966.
- Toner, James H. *The Sword and the Cross: Reflections on Command and Conscience*. NY: Praeger Publishers, 1992.
- Weigel, George. *The Peace Bishops and the Arms Race: Can Religious Leadership Help in Preventing War?* Chicago, IL: World Without War Publications, 1982.

DISTRIBUTION A:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Air War College
Maxwell AFB, Al 36112